## **REMARKS**

Regarding the specification, the specification stands objected for improper claim language for the abstract. Regarding the claims, claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Prood. Claims 1, 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Myler et al. Claims 11 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by More. Claims 2, 3, 7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prood in view of Ward et al. Claims 6, 12 and 16 stand objected to as being depended upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 17-20 were not addressed in the office action.

The specification stands objected for containing legal phraseology in the abstract of the invention. However, the office action is not specific as to which legal phraseology is at issue. Applicant assumes the use of "means" was the legal phraseology objected to; therefore, the amended abstract no longer includes term. Although Applicant believes that the abstract is now in allowable form, the examiner is urged to contact Applicant is further revision is necessary.

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Prood. Claim 1 is now canceled. Accordingly, the 102 rejection of this claim is respectfully overcome. Claim 4 is now amended so that it depends directly from claim 6. Further claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Because claim 4 now depends from a claim

that has been indicated as allowable, the 102 rejection of claim 4 is now respectfully overcome.

Claims 1, 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Myler et al. Claims 1 and 5 are now canceled. Therefore, the 102 rejection of these claims is respectfully overcome. Further, claim 8 is now amended so that it depends directly from claim 6. As discussed, claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Because claim 8 now depends from a claim that has been indicated as allowable, the 102 rejection of claim 8 is now respectfully overcome.

Claims 11 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by More. Claim 11 is now canceled. Therefore, the 102 rejection of this claim is respectfully overcome. Claims 13-14 are now amended so that they depend directly from claim 12. Further, claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Because claims 13-14 now depend from a claim that has been indicated as allowable, the 102 rejection of claims 13-14 is now respectfully overcome. Additionally, because claim 15 depends from claim 14, which is now in allowable form, the 102 rejection of claim 15 is now respectfully overcome.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prood in view of Ward et al. Claims 2, 3, 7, 9 and 10 are now amended so that they depend directly from claim 6. As discussed, claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Because claims 2, 3, 7, 9 and 10 now depend from a claim that has

been indicated as allowable, the 103 rejection of these claims is now respectfully overcome.

Based on the forgoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of it is requested. If examiner disagrees, he is urged to call the attorney for the application at the number provided below.

Date: January 14, 2004

Michael A. Mann

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No.: 32,825

Nexsen Pruet LLC P.O. Drwr 2426

Columbia, SC 29202-2426

803-540-2111

scentioni@nexsenpruet.com